

### **REMARKS**

This application has been reviewed in view of the Office Action mailed on August 30, 2004. Claims 1-25 are pending in the application with claims 1, 2, 13, 24 and 25 being in independent form. By the present Amendment, claims 1, 2, and 8-10 have been amended in part, and claims 13-25 have been added. No new matter is believed to be introduced by the amendments.

The abstract was objected to because it was not directed to a method of cleaning and decontaminating. Applicant believes that this objection has been overcome by the addition of claims 13-24, which claim the apparatus for cleaning and decontaminating, in accordance with MPEP § 608.01(b). The abstract is directed to a method and apparatus, and the claims are also now directed to a method and apparatus.

The title of the invention has been amended such that Applicant believes it is clearly indicative of the claimed invention.

The words “, now U.S. Patent No. 6,618,890,” have been inserted into the specification on page 1, line 4 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description. Applicant believes that this objection has been overcome by the removal and alteration of the language which the Examiner believed did not comply with the written description. Specifically, the language pertaining to the distance between internal working components has been stricken. Also, the language beginning on line 5 of page 9

(paragraph 33) discloses that the thickness of the base material may vary depending on the piece of the equipment being cleaned. This language clearly implies that the thickness of the base material is configured to make sure contact is made with the internal parts of the equipment when the equipment is disposed in a normally engaged position, thus ensuring the parts are able to be cleaned.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has followed Examiner's suggestion by removing the term "at least" from claim 1, lines 8 and 10, and claim 2, lines 5 and 7. Additionally, Applicant amended claims 8-10 to overcome the any further objection to these claims relating to antecedent basis.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.


Claims 13-25 have been added. Claims 13-24 relate to an apparatus of the present disclosure and are believed to go hand-in-hand with the method disclosed in claims 1-12. Support for these claims and for the method of claim 25 can be found riddled throughout the specification and in the figures.

## **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely claims 1-25, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul J. Natof  
Reg. No. 54,333  
Attorney for Applicant

**Carter, DeLuca, Farrell & Schmidt, LLP**  
445 Broad Hollow Road  
Suite 225  
Melville, New York 11747  
Tel.: (631) 501-5700  
Fax: (631) 501-3526